



Montana
Office of Public Instruction
Denise Juneau, State Superintendent

opi.mt.gov

Office of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 202501
Helena, MT, 59620-2501
(406) 444-3095
(888) 231-9393
(406) 444-0169 (TTY)
opi.mt.gov

Continuous School Improvement Plan
Annual Performance Report Accountability Process
School Year 2011-12
Small Schools Accountability Process (SSAP)

Guide to the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report

Small Schools Accountability Process (SSAP) evaluation is based on several significant factors. These factors include the Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) scores, the Annual Performance Report (APR) of the Continuous School Improvement Plan (CSI), CRT score year-to-year improvement, and attendance or graduation rate. The CRT data, graduation rate, and attendance rate are quantitative and consist of multiple data sets. The total possible points for every school and district will vary according to the number of years and students tested. The Annual Performance Report is a qualitative evaluation of goals, action plans, professional development and curriculum development for the schools and districts. The various components of the SSP are weighted on a scale from one to ten based on their relative importance. Together, the quantitative and qualitative factors generate a comprehensive overview of a school's or district's progress in the continuous school improvement process.

Phase I

Part I Data compilation

Phase II

Part 1 CRT Achievement-Three Years of Data

- One point possible per year in school years 2009-10 and 2010-11 for making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 84.4 percent of students proficient in reading.
- One point possible per year in school year 2011-12 for making the AMO of 89.6 percent of students proficient in reading.
- One point possible per year in school years 2009-10 and 2010-11 for making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 70 percent of students proficient in math.
- One point possible per year in school year 2011-12 for making the AMO of 80 percent of students proficient in math.
- One point possible per year for each student group making the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) in each subject.
 - If there are ten or more students in the student group

The actual points are weighted by ten.

In the example below, the district had no students tested in one of the three years, so there are only two possible points instead of three.

Small Schools Accountability Process Score Summary - School Year

County:		Legal Entity:		School Code:	
SCHOOL		Total Points (Weighted) : 152.5 of 250 (61.0%)			
Phase II		Points (unweighted) for Phase II : 14 of 21			
Part 1	CRT Achievement	Weight Factor:	10	Actual Points	Possible Points
	Subject	Subgroup			
	Reading	All students		1	3
	Reading	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native		0	2
	Reading	Economically Disadvantaged		0	2
	Math	All students		2	3
	Math	Am. Indian/Alaskan Native		2	2
	Math	Economically Disadvantaged		2	2

Student group did not meet AMO

Part 1 CRT Participation Rate

- One point possible for achieving a rate of 95 percent
 - Based on the best rate from:
 - Current year,
 - Current year averaged with previous year, or
 - Current year averaged with previous two years.

The actual point is weighted by two.

For example, consider a school whose participation rate dropped to 94 percent for the current year. If in the previous two years, the rates were 95 percent and 96 percent then the state may average these three years to meet the 95 percent participation rate requirement.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction provides vision, advocacy, support, and leadership for schools and communities to ensure that all students meet today's challenges and tomorrow's opportunities.

Part 2 Attendance Rate or Cohort Graduation Rate Indicator

- Grades K-8
 - One point for meeting the 80 percent threshold or showed improvement toward meeting that threshold for attendance rate from the previous year.
- Grades 9-12
 - One point for meeting the 85 percent threshold or for a 2 percentage point improvement toward meeting that threshold for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate from the previous year.

The actual point is weighted by two.

Phase III

Part 1 Annual Performance Report (APR)

- See enclosed sample scoring rubric.
- Fourteen items for AYP (questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16(full points), 6, 7, 14, 15 (half points)).
 1. Z on the scoring guide equals 1 point.
 2. Y on the scoring guide equals .5 point.
 3. X on the scoring guide equals 0.
 4. For yes/no questions, when scored:
 1. Yes = 1
 2. No = 0
- Other items for feedback report only (plus overall comments).

The actual points are weighted by five.

Part 2 CRT Improvement- over time using these two intervals

SY 09-10 to SY 10-11 and SY 10-11 to SY 11-12

- One point possible for the “all students” group showing improvement in reading from each previous year.
- One point possible for the “all students” group showing improvement in math from each previous year.
- One point possible per other student group showing improvement in each subject from the previous year.
 - If there are ten or more students in the student group.
- Improvement is measured by increase in the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in the assessment.
- The improvement point for a student group and subject is awarded if the following year “proficient or advanced” percentage is 100 percent.

The actual points are weighted by three.